



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,620	01/30/2002	Travis Myron Cossel	10012155-1	8237

7590 11/03/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN HON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/060,620

Applicant(s)

COSSEL ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Hon Chen

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 3, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not disclose erasing the authenticated parameter table upon a successful authentication of a predefined number of unauthenticated user parameters. Instead, the specification discloses erasing data after a time-out or period of inactivity (page 14 lines 5-15). The claimed limitation does not exactly correspond to the limitation disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

Art Unit: 2131

person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuh et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6463474 (hereinafter Fuh) in view of Crawford UK Pat. Application No. 2331820 (hereinafter Crawford) and further in view of Moreh et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20030046391 (hereinafter Moreh).

6. As per claim 1, Fuh discloses a method for parameter authentication, comprising: examining an authenticated parameter table to determine whether an unauthenticated user parameter is listed therein (Fuh: abstract and column 3 lines 1-19 and lines 60: local authentication and if local authentication fails, perform remote authentication); and bypassing authentication of the unauthenticated user parameter if the unauthenticated user parameter is listed in the authenticated parameter table (Fuh: abstract and column 3 lines 1-19 and lines 60: local authentication and if local authentication fails, perform remote authentication). Fuh does not explicitly disclose executing a plurality of authentication agents in a computer system, each of the authentication agents being configured to initiate the performance of at least one authentication task to authenticate an unauthenticated user parameter for one of a plurality of functions, each of the functions corresponding to one of the authentication agents and for each respective one of the authentication agents, perform the above mentioned authentication technique. However, Crawford discloses a multi-functional computer system that authenticates a user prior to authorizing access to functions of the system (Crawford: page 1 lines 5-7:

Art Unit: 2131

multi-function systems; page 1 lines 12-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply the authentication technique in network environment to a standalone computing device when access to particular computer function is requested. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Crawford within the system of Fuh because it allows computer system functions to be used by unauthorized users. Fuh as modified does not explicitly disclose executing a plurality of authentication agents and determining which agent to use. However, Moreh discloses a federated authentication service that allows a authentication agent to determine which authentication mechanism should be used and allows multiple authentication types and multiple authentication sources from different domains of protocol (Moreh: [0010], [0015], and [0044]-[0045]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply different authentication techniques when user requests different program/function because users with different roles might use different functions of the computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Moreh within the combination of Fuh-Crawford because it different authentication types allows verification of different personal data relating to use of the computer system.

7. As per claim 2, Fuh as modified discloses the method of claim 1. Fuh further discloses the method comprising obtaining the unauthenticated user parameter from a user by way of a user interface (Fuh: column 4 lines 4-13).

Art Unit: 2131

8. As per claim 3, Fuh as modified discloses the method of claim 1. Fuh further discloses the method comprising erasing the authenticated parameter table upon a successful authentication of a predefined number of unauthenticated user parameters (Fuh: column 5 lines 11-20: removing the authorization information).

9. As per claim 4, Fuh as modified discloses the method of claim 1. Fuh further discloses the method comprising initiating the performance of the at least one authentication task to authenticate the unauthenticated user parameter if the unauthenticated user parameter is not listed in the authenticated parameter table (Fuh: abstract and column 3 lines 1-19 and lines 60: local authentication and if local authentication fails, perform remote authentication; Moreh: [0044]-[0045]: determining suitable authentication mechanism).

10. As per claim 5, Fuh as modified discloses the method of claim 2. Fuh further discloses wherein the step of obtaining the user parameter from a user by way of a user interface further comprises obtaining at least one user parameter from the group consisting of a biometric parameter, a password, a username, a code, a key, and a signature (Fuh: column 4 lines 8-13).

11. As per claim 6, Fuh discloses the method of claim 4. Fuh further discloses the method comprising storing the authenticated user parameter in an authenticated parameter table upon a successful authentication thereof (Fuh: column 4 lines 4-13: update the authorization information).

12. As per claim 7-17, claims 7-17 encompass the same scope as claims 1-6.

Therefore, claims 7-17 are rejected based on the reasons set forth in claims 1-6.

13. As per claim 18, Fuh discloses a method for parameter authentication, comprising: obtaining the unauthenticated user parameter from a user by way of a user interface (Fuh: column 4 lines 8-13); examining an authenticated parameter table to determine whether the unauthenticated user parameter is listed therein (Fuh: abstract and column 3 lines 1-19 and lines 60: local authentication and if local authentication fails, perform remote authentication); bypassing authentication of the unauthenticated user parameter if the unauthenticated user parameter is listed in the authenticated parameter table therein (Fuh: abstract and column 3 lines 1-19 and lines 60: local authentication and if local authentication fails, perform remote authentication); authenticating the unauthenticated user parameter if the unauthenticated user parameter is not listed in the authenticated parameter table (Fuh: column 4 lines 4-13); and storing the authenticated user parameter in the authenticated parameter table upon a successful authentication thereof (Fuh: column 4 lines 4-13). Fuh does not explicitly disclose executing a plurality of authentication agents in a computer system, each of the authentication agents being configured to initiate the performance of at least one authentication task to authenticate an unauthenticated user parameter for one of a plurality of functions, each of the functions corresponding to one of the authentication agents and for each respective one of the authentication agents, perform the above mentioned authentication technique. However, Crawford discloses a multi-functional computer system that authenticates a

Art Unit: 2131

user prior to authorizing access to functions of the system (Crawford: page 1 lines 5-7: multi-function systems; page 1 lines 12-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply the authentication technique in network environment to a standalone computing device when access to particular computer function is requested. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Crawford within the system of Fuh because it allows computer system functions to be used by unauthorized users. Fuh as modified does not explicitly disclose executing a plurality of authentication agents and determining which agent to use. However, Moreh discloses a federated authentication service that allows a authentication agent to determine which authentication mechanism should be used and allows multiple authentication types and multiple authentication sources from different domains of protocol (Moreh: [0010], [0015], and [0044]-[0045]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply different authentication techniques when user requests different program/function because users with different roles might use different functions of the computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Moreh within the combination of Fuh-Crawford because it different authentication types allows verification of different personal data relating to use of the computer system.

14. As per claim 19, claim 19 encompasses the same scope as claim 18. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected based on the same reason set forth in claim 18.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bauman et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6898711 discloses user authentication system and method for multiple process applications.

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2131


3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shin-Hon Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

SC


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100